



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF DISTINGUISHED PERSONS.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE, WRITINGS AND CHARACTER OF JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS, PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AT GOTTINGEN.

**A**LTHOUGH 19 years have elapsed since the decease of this illustrious man, during which time his name has become even more familiar to English scholars than it was before his death, no regular biographical account of him has yet appeared, we believe, in our language. It is presumed that an attempt to supply this deficiency, by a memoir drawn from authentic sources, will be acceptable to the readers of the Monthly Repository.\*

In the year 1793 a small volume was published, by Professor Hassencamp, of Rinteln, which contains a life of Michaelis by himself, with notes by Hassencamp; a memoir on his literary character by Eichhorn; observations on the same subject by Schulz, and a Latin eulogium, pronounced before the Royal Society of Gottingen, on the occasion of his death, by Heyne. From this volume, and from Schlichtegroll's Necrology, (Supp. 1798) the materials for the ensuing memoir have been drawn.

John David Michaelis was born February 27, 1717, at Halle. His father was Christian Benedict Michaelis, Professor of theology and oriental languages in the university of Halle; a man whose fame has not been entirely eclipsed by the splendour of his son's reputation. He received the early part of his education at home, under masters, who, as he relates, disgusted him by their mechanical method of teaching, and whom he displeased by his impa-

tience and want of steadiness. They forced him, however, to learn the Latin grammar thoroughly, and he made considerable progress in geography and history under their direction. When 11 years old, (1729) he was sent to the public school of the Orphan-house in Halle, where he continued till he was 15. His father appears, from the first, to have destined him for a Professorship, but his early education did not give him the knowledge that should have prepared him for that office. He began to learn Greek only about half a year before he came to school; nor did he much increase his scanty stock while he remained at the Orphan-house. The New Testament was the only Greek book read by scholars of any standing. He made more progress in Latin, although the course of authors read was too confined. In particular, he acquired a great fluency in Latin composition. In one of the classes which he attended, there was only three scholars. It was part of their business to hold a disputation in Latin every week; of his two companions one was ill during the greater part of the session, the other was regularly absent on disputation-days, so that Michaelis and his master were the only disputants, and took it by turns to be opponent and respondent. This frequent exercise gave him through life a great facility in Latin composition, and assisted him in arranging his ideas. Baumgarten's philosophical lectures were the most useful part of his studies at school. The philosophy of Wolff, who had been banished from Halle, was then proscribed in the university; but Baumgarten taught it without molestation in the Orphan-house, omitting only the er-

\* The work from which this account is extracted.

fensive doctrines of Monads and pre-established harmony. Fantastic and unintelligible as many things in this philosophy are, it was the best then known in Germany: Michaëlis imbibed it with great delight, and asserts, that its influence on his habits of thinking may be traced in all his writings.

Having continued the full course of four years at the Orphan-house, he past to the university in 1733. It was usual with Baumgarten, when pupils went from the highest class to the university, to send with them a report of their conduct while at school. That which he sent with Michaëlis praised his attainments, and prophesied well of him, "*si illos scopulos præterectus fuerit.*" These awful words Michaëlis did not then understand; but he afterwards learnt that Baumgarten feared that he would become an unbeliever. This suspicion may be easily accounted for. Pietism reigned in a very high degree at that time among the superintendants of the Orphan-house, and Michaëlis having, as he confesses, no strong impression of religion on his mind, though perfectly correct in his moral conduct, might easily fall under an ill name. This is his own account: his other biographers, however, think that his mind was a good deal impressed by the pietism which prevailed in the school, and that it gave him, through life, a tendency to devotional raptures, greater than is commonly found among literary men, and which did not suit the general coldness of his temper. At any rate, Baumgarten's apprehension was wholly unfounded.

The university of Halle, when Michaëlis entered it, was little qualified to form a good scholar, or an enlightened theologian. Rational philosophy had been banished with Wolff, and pietism had brought human learn-

ing into neglect. The elder Michaëlis was the greatest orientalist in Germany, but his knowledge, instead of being applied to the elucidation of the sacred writings, was exhausted in tracing the analogies of Greek and German words to those of the Arabic and Hebrew languages. Lange's "*Cæconomia Salutis*" was the oracle and standard in theology; and to deny its merit was almost as dangerous as to question its doctrines.

We cannot wonder, therefore, if the university of Halle did little to excite the energy of Michaëlis' mind, to enlarge or form it. It was here, however, that he made those oriental acquirements, which were the foundation of his future fame. He had learnt Hebrew before he entered the university, and he studied under his father, Syriac, Arabic, Æthiopic and Rabbinical Hebrew. He read Homer and Herodian (!) with Schulz, and, to perfect himself in Latin, undertook to teach one of the classes in the Orphan-house gratuitously. The study which he pursued with the greatest delight was history, which continued to be his favourite to the end of his life, which he studied philosophically, and of his accurate acquaintance with which traces may be perceived in his introduction to the New Testament.

Theology he learnt from his former master in philosophy, Baumgarten, in whose school several of the most eminent theologians in Germany were afterwards formed. But Michaëlis, disgusted with the systematic way of teaching, paid little attention to his lectures, and never took notes of them. He could not but perceive the futility of the proofs which were alleged for many of the doctrines attributed to Christianity, and observes, that had he not learnt in England a better method of interpreting the Bible, and defending orthodoxy, he should probably

have become an unbeliever, or a heretic, as many of Baumgarten's scholars afterwards did. If it were true that he cared little for religion when at the Orphan-house, he must have undergone a great change in the university, for we find him oppressed by religious scruples, which affected his health. The Lutherans, in their explanation of the Lord's Supper, contend strongly against the Calvinists for the literal sense of scripture. Michaëlis thought that if one passage of scripture must be taken literally, in spite of all the reasons for a figurative interpretation, the same method must be followed with all, and he was distressed by the rigid morality which some passages of the gospel, thus interpreted, appeared to teach.

He remained at the university till 1740, wearied of its occupations, but without any serious thoughts of his future employment. He earnestly wished to travel, and his father at length assented, and allowed him to visit England in the year 1741. Before he went, he published two Theses, which he defended for his degree, "*De punctorum Hebraicorum antiquitate*," and "*De Psalmo xxii.*" the doctrines maintained in which he afterwards renounced.

In his way to England he passed through Holland, where he remained some time, hearing the lectures of the celebrated Schultens. He staid 12 months in England, of which he spent a great part at Oxford, where he had free access to the Bodleian library, and examined many of the MSS. especially of the Old Testament, which are preserved there. It was then the opinion of learned men, both in Germany and England, that the variations of the Hebrew MSS. affected nothing but the vowel-points, and Michaëlis searching only for such variations, according to his father's instructions,

overlooked the more important differences which Kennicott's collations disclosed. He heard Lowth deliver his second prelection on Hebrew poetry, but he formed no personal acquaintance with him.

Michaëlis' visit to England was the memorable era of his life. Nothing that we have hitherto seen of his talents and acquirements, prepares us to believe that he would stand at the head of the literati of Germany. "He left the university," says Eichhorn, "with a head full of false opinions, and very sparingly provided with the qualifications of a theologian and commentator. Nothing but the sense of his own deficiencies, and an energetic determination to supply them, not only by the acquisition of the learning which he wanted, but by a strict examination of his own opinions and habits of thinking, could have enabled him to surmount the difficulties of his situation." This change does not however, appear to have taken place during his actual residence in England. It was too radical, laborious and voluntary to be the work of 12 months, or the sudden result of a change of society and reading. But he acquired a complete acquaintance with our language, and carried back to the Continent some of our best theological writers, whom he closely studied for several years after his return. He left England in 1742, and began to teach history and some of the eastern languages in the university of Halle. The orthodox members of it soon perceived a change in him, and thanked heaven for their deliverance, when he removed in 1745 to Gottingen.

Gottingen was not infected by the theological prejudices which reigned at Halle. It was adorned by Mosheim, Haller, and J. M. Gesner, who admitted Michaëlis into their friendship, and from whom, espe-

cially from Haller, he received very important assistance in the improvement of his intellectual character. For some time after his settlement at Gottingen, he seems to have been engaged in the study of the Bible with his English guides. In 1746, he published Benson on James, in Latin, with notes of his own; and in 1747, Peirce on the Hebrews, and issued proposals, but without encouragement, for a translation of Hallett's notes. As he advanced, he became less satisfied with his models, and in 1750, published a translation and commentary of his own on the shorter epistles of Paul. In this work, he abandoned the method of paraphrasing, as destroying the identity of the author, and tending to conceal, both from the writer and the reader, their ignorance of his true meaning. Instead of it, he gave a literal translation with copious notes.

He removed to Gottingen at first only as a private lecturer in the University. In 1746, he was appointed extraordinary, and in 1750, ordinary Professor of Philosophy. In 1751, he was chosen Secretary to the newly-instituted Society of Sciences at Gottingen; and in 1769, on the death of Gesner, President. Some disagreement with the members, occasioned his resignation in 1770, from which time till his death he had no connection with them.

In 1750, he published the first edition of his *Introduction to the New Testament*. This was his favourite work; he laboured incessantly to enlarge and improve it, and his own maturer thoughts, and the discoveries of his contemporaries, furnished him with so much new matter, that the 4th edition, which Marsh translated, is a totally different book from the first. There is no instance on record, we believe, of a book retaining the same title,

and being so completely re-written in successive editions: the fact shows in a very striking light, the progression of our author's knowledge, the imperfection of this branch of sacred criticism in the middle of the last century, and its rapid advances during the latter half of it.

In 1758, he published an edition of Lowth's *Prelections*, with notes and *Epimetra*, one of his works which first made him known in England, in consequence of its being reprinted at the Clarendon press. No two men could undertake the same work with more different qualifications, than Michaëlis and Lowth. The bishop was a man of refined taste, but formed entirely upon classical models; he was an elegant writer of Latin prose, and a ready composer of Latin verse: but knowing no oriental language except the Hebrew, and not being familiar with the manners and customs of the East, he judged of the sacred writers by a classical standard, and European ideas. Michaëlis, on the other hand, had very little taste, wrote stiff Latin, and had never received a good classical education. But he was an accomplished orientalist; he could discover in the kindred dialects the meaning of an obscure Hebrew word, which Lowth would alter by conjecture; he could understand the local allusions of the sacred writers, and estimate their merits more rationally than by comparing them with Greek and Latin authors. His notes were therefore a most valuable supplement to Lowth's *Prelections*, and both together continue to be the best introduction that we have to Hebrew poetry.

In 1760, he gained the prize of the Academy of Berlin, by his Essay "on the influence of opinions on language, and language on opinions." This work introduced him to the no-

tice of Frederic the Great, and D'Al-embert. In the same year, he published his "Compendium Theologiæ Dogmaticæ." Although not Professor of theology, he had lectured on it for several years, and was accused of being a Calvinist. The orthodoxy of his compendium, however, past unquestioned in Germany; but the University of Upsal discovered it to be unsound, and confiscated a Swedish translation of it. Eighteen years afterwards, the Chancellor of this University, ashamed of its illiberality, persuaded the King to bestow the order of the Northern Star on the Professor, as a national compensation for the injury he had sustained.

Nothing contributed more to raise the fame of Michaëlis throughout Europe, than the questions which he addressed, in the year 1762, to the learned men, appointed by the King of Denmark to explore Arabia Felix, of whose travels Niebuhr, the sole survivor of the company, has left so interesting an account. The plan of the expedition was originally suggested by Michaëlis to Count Bernstorff, and when it was matured, he was requested to draw up a set of questions to guide them in their researches. The knowledge of natural history, geography, oriental languages and manners, which these questions displayed, astonished the world, who found that the author was a German Professor, chiefly occupied with theological lectures, and who had been accustomed to regard theology as a mysterious art, the Professors of which had as little affinity with other literary men in their pursuits, as with the world at large in their habits and opinions. Forskal [or Forskol] and Von Haven, two of the travellers, had been pupils of Michaëlis, had learnt Arabic from him, and had often heard him

point out, in the course of his lectures, the defects of our present knowledge of the East: none could, therefore, be better qualified for understanding his queries. Unfortunately, the copy was not completed when they left Europe, and though Bernstorff sent it after them with all possible expedition to Egypt, it did not arrive till the travellers were at Tranquebar, after performing their first journey through Arabia, when Forskal [or Forskol] and Von Haven were no more\*.

In 1769, appeared his translation of the book of Job, with notes for the use of the unlearned. This was the first part of a complete translation of the Bible, excepting the Song of Songs, which he deemed not canonical. The last part was not published till 1792, after his death. The style of the translation is harsh and inelegant. The notes, though said to be for the use of the unlearned, as not being critical, contain a vast mass of curious and useful information. Daihe, whose translation, with notes, of the Old Testament is known in this country, has been much indebted to Michaëlis.

In 1770, he published his "Mosaic Law," which his countrymen regard as one of his most original and valuable works. He possessed not only a very extensive knowledge of history and jurisprudence, but an

---

\* In 1766, Michaelis was visited by Dr. Franklin, with whom he had a remarkable conversation on the subject of America. Michaelis observed, that when he was in England, he thought, that the Americans would ere long revolt from the mother country; and that he thought so still, though those to whom he mentioned his opinion, treated it with ridicule. Franklin replied, "*that such a revolt was impossible*, for that the principal towns in North America, Boston, New-York, and Philadelphia, could be laid in ruins by an English fleet."

intimate acquaintance with Eastern peculiarities of manners and ideas, so necessary to explain the views of the Jewish law-giver, and enable us to calculate the effect of his institutions. In 1771, Michaëlis began his "*Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek*," a periodical publication, which contains a treasure of oriental and biblical learning, and which, from the constant references made to it by all the German theological writers, is absolutely necessary to those who study their works. It was continued till 1785, in 23 volumes, and was resumed in 1786, and continued, in 8 volumes, to 1791, under the title of "*Neue Orientalische*," &c. Professor Tychsen, of Göttingen, was joint-editor with Michaëlis of the 2d part. An article in this work engaged Michaëlis in a dispute with Dr. Kennicott. He had procured for Kennicott the collation of the valuable Cassel MS., and had excited a great enthusiasm for collation among his pupils, and had been on the most friendly terms with him while the work was going forward. When the first volume was published in 1776, Michaëlis reviewed it in his *Bibliothek*, and expressed himself disappointed by it. Kennicott replied in angry manner, and their friendship ceased. The Continental critics speak in general with little respect of Kennicott's talents. He certainly wanted the oriental learning which some of them possessed, and they allege that he was but moderately skilled in Hebrew. It is admitted on all hands, that his collations have produced much less benefit to sacred criticism, than was expected from them, and perhaps these critics unjustly attributed to him a disappointment which arose from exaggerated ideas of the value of the Masoretic MSS.

Michaëlis published at intervals from 1784 to his death, his "*Supplementa Lexicis Hebraicis*," in 6 vols.

4to. This contains the result of 40 years study of the Bible and the Eastern languages, and is perhaps on the whole, his greatest work. He also reprinted Castel's Syriac Lexicon from his *Heptaglot*, with notes and additions of his own, in 1787-8. These works, together with his translation, of which we have already spoken, chiefly occupied him till his death. We have omitted mentioning many of his smaller publications.

During the greater part of the time from his settlement at Göttingen, Michaëlis was engaged three or four hours a day as a public lecturer. He was Professor of philosophy, but was most celebrated as a lecturer in theology, and teacher of the oriental languages. He had large classes, in which were found students from all parts of Europe. Besides these employments, he superintended the *Reviews*, or, "*Zeitung von Gelehrten Sachen*," as long as he continued connected with the Royal Society. Nor was his time wholly occupied with his literary engagements, various as they were. His civil avocations were numerous; he was a member of the Hanoverian council of State, and for a long time enjoyed the confidence of Münchhausen, the prime minister. He preached several times at Halle, and constantly in London, but never at Göttingen. He refused the Professorship of theology partly because he scrupled to sign the Lutheran confessions, although attached in general to the doctrines of that church.

It is hardly necessary to say, that a man of such extensive and varied knowledge, was a very interesting companion. He possessed great vivacity, and a considerable share of wit, which he was rather too studious of displaying. He does not appear, however, to have been an amiable man. He had a propensity

to satire, which seldom accompanies an affectionate temper. He was accused of being fond of money; and it is admitted that he was eager to acquire and retain it. But his love of gain was never gratified at the expense of his integrity; and the charge of parsimony, though partly just, was in a great measure founded upon his conscientious refusal to give charity in the common and obvious ways. He would never remit his fees to poor students, as other Professors did; and he made it a rule to give nothing to public beggars. He had probably observed that many young men wish to intrude themselves into learned professions, from mere dislike to mechanical labour; that those who could not afford to pay the fees of a lecturer, had not in general been able to purchase that previous education without which lectures would be of little service to them; and he perhaps thought it a vulgar error, that genius is lost to the possessor and the world, if it cannot be devoted exclusively to literature.

Michaelis was not free from vanity, and wished to appear as a man of universal knowledge. He was charged with preferring English writers to those of his own country; if the charge be true, it may have arisen from the absence of rivalry between himself and foreigners, or from the circumstance of his owing his earliest light to the authors of our country. He appears to have been jealous of Semler, but after opposing his theory of the latinizing MSS. for many years, he declared himself a convert to it in the last edition of his introduction. His integrity and adherence to truth were scrupulous; and in personal morals he was strict, even to rigour.

A profile of him is prefixed to the volume of memoirs, which Hassenkamp declares to be a most striking

likeness. It is a fine head, very characteristic of his penetrating, lively and satirical mind. "The high forehead and spreading *occiput*," says Hassenkamp, 'show that he had room to take in a large stock of knowledge; the history of his life will prove, that even the smallest crevices were filled with erudition.'

Michaelis was not a hard student, in the common acception of the word. He had many occupations besides study, and he neither sat up very late nor rose very early. When this was noticed to him, he used to reply in the words of the 127th psalm, 2d verse, "whom the Lord loveth, to them he giveth sleep." The vigour of his mind compensated for the shortness of his application, and he enjoyed the benefit of his temperance in a life prolonged to 74, with the full use of his faculties. He died August 22, 1791. His admirers were mortified that his death occasioned no great public sensation. But it cannot be expected that grief will be violent, where there is not some actual loss of good enjoyed or anticipated. The public had received from Michaelis all that they could hope for; there was nothing for expectation to magnify; and they beheld his removal with less emotion than they would have felt at the death of a younger man, though of inferior talents.

The merits of Michaëlis can be estimated but imperfectly by a view of his attainments, unless we also consider the difficulties through which he struggled to acquire them; nor are the additions which he made to the theological literature of Europe, the adequate measure of his services to his own countrymen.—England, France, Germany and Holland, are the four states which furnish the history of biblical criticism. Of these, at the birth of Michaëlis, Germany was probably

the lowest in the scale, but long before his death she had attained a decided pre-eminence over all the rest. Of this change his own genius was the principal cause.

Michaëlis had to contend not only with disadvantages of education and the imperfections of theological knowledge, but with the general backwardness of German literature. He had to kindle separately and for himself, those lights whose united blaze he threw on his peculiar science. He did not find civil and natural history, geography and jurisprudence matured and perfect, and apply the results at which others had arrived, to the amelioration of biblical criticism; although to have done this would have made an era in its annals. He studied each of them as if he had meant to devote himself to it, and would have been remembered among the improvers of each, if he had not attained such a commanding superiority in that science for whose sake he cultivated the rest.

We have related the chief events of the life of Michaëlis, and the order of the principal publications. We shall now proceed to give a more connected view of his labours. It would be impossible to do this in a manner more interesting or instructive to the reader, than by translating and abridging the memoir of Eichhorn, who of all men is best qualified to appreciate the talents of Michaëlis. He considers his character as a *philologist*, a *critic*, an *interpreter*, and a *theologian*, according to the fourfold division which the Germans adopt.

"The oriental languages had been studied in Germany for a considerable time before the appearance of Michaëlis, but on a very narrow and unproductive plan. Orientalists were slavishly devoted to the Rabbinical Lexicon, and to discover the

meaning of a doubtful word, or to obtain one to which some meaning could be affixed, had recourse to conjecture from the necessity of the sense, or arbitrary transpositions and substitutions of letters. Very few in Europe, and perhaps none in Germany, followed the example of Castet, and studied all the dialects of the descendants of Shem in a connected view. At length, Cromeier in Germany, and Albert Schultens in Holland, one in a confined situation and with small effect, the other at the head of the university of Leyden, and with very powerful influence, directed the studies of orientalists by a more rational method.

"Michaëlis had brought from the instructive school of his father a large store of oriental knowledge. But to digest this knowledge, to separate the gold from the dross, to introduce more philosophy into the study of eastern literature, and make it more conducive to the explanation of the scriptures, was the labour of years. During the first ten years of his residence at Gottengin, he was diligently studying the sources of Hebrew philology, and the writings of Schultens. The first fruit of his labours was his "Treatise on the proper method of learning the Hebrew Language," (1756) the last, "his *Supplementa Lex. Heb.*" which comprises the result of the studies of his whole life in this department. It consists of a critical examination of all the Hebrew Lexicons, the acceptations which they attribute to words, and the etymologies which they assign for them, according to the principles which he had laid down in his earlier years. Those who follow him step by step through this work, will be amazed that a man of his susceptible and lively mind could submit to the dry and uninteresting labour of which it is the fruit, and wonder not that it has its

inaccuracies, but that they are so few. It is only to be regretted that while he has made so faithful and diligent a use of all the printed sources of information, his situation at Göttingen should have afforded him no access to the manuscript oriental Lexicons. Here is a field opened to those scholars who are placed in more fortunate circumstances. His grammars of the Syriac and Arabic languages, if they contain nothing fundamentally new, after the works of his father, Erpenius and Schultens, exhibit the rules of grammar in an easier and more philosophical form.

“His philological labours on the New Testament are less meritorious than on the Old. In the latter he led the way and carried on the work alone, in the former he only followed and co-operated. He attached himself to Carpzov, Krebs and others, who, about his time, abandoned the custom that had prevailed of illustrating the language of the New Testament from classical authors only, and compared its phraseology with that of Josephus, Philo and the Septuagint. Michaelis contributed his share, however, to the improvement thus made, by comparing Syriac, Chaldaic and Talmudical expressions with those of the New Testament. No one of his contemporaries equalled him in this; but in profound and comprehensive knowledge of the Greek he yielded to Ernesti and some others.

In teaching the doctrines of christianity, Michaelis conformed himself to the confession of the Lutheran church, in spirit at least, if not in letter. The reader may perhaps wonder, that he who learnt his theology from Benson and Pierce, should not have embraced their opinions as well as copied their manner. The character of Michaelis, however, forbids the suspicion of dissimulation; nor is it at all wonderful that

his views were less extended than those of others, who were educated amidst all that knowledge which it cost him such labour to acquire and to diffuse. We believe him to have been sincerely orthodox. In the early part of his career, he was viewed with suspicion and treated with harshness by the patrons of the established faith, who were doubtful where his improvements would terminate. But towards the close of his life, he was regarded as the bulwark of orthodoxy against those whom his own lectures and writings had disciplined and armed for its attack. Nor was he less earnest to check the growth of infidelity, than that of heresy; his name is joined with those of Semler and Doderlein in the list of answers to the celebrated Wollenbüttel fragments. While he lamented the errors and extravagancies into which his countrymen fell, he was far from wishing to abridge that freedom of discussion in which they originated. He spoke warmly against them in his writings, but never indulged himself in personal reflections against their authors, and protested against all restrictions on the liberty of controverting the doctrines of the church.

The vivacity which Michaelis joined to his extensive knowledge made him a very popular and interesting lecturer. He did not read, but spoke from copious notes, and with a degree of energy and enthusiasm which communicated interest to the driest subjects.

Michaelis' fault was a superfluity of wit, and an ambition to make his hearers laugh. He would often contrive, says Schultz, to finish a lecture with a *bon-mot*, and immediately descending from his rostrum, would turn back to the audience, who were convulsed with laughter, when he reached the door, with a smile of

gratitude for their applause. It sometimes happened too, that as he recomposed every course of lectures as often as he delivered them, the variety of his business did not allow him to finish more than half what was necessary to fill up the hour, in which case he was compelled to supply the deficiency with any thing that he could bring in, whether connected with his lecture or not. He paid great atten-

tion to young men of talents among his pupils, guiding their studies, and procuring for and placing them in advantageous situations. But when he had done this their connexion ceased; he had furnished them with a favourable field for the exertion of those talents which he believed them to possess, and thought it right then to leave them to make their own way.

---

### DETACHED ANECDOTES.

---

#### EARLY NAVIGATORS.

**A**RNGRIM JONAS tell us, that when Flock, a famous Norwegian navigator, was going to set out from Shetland for Iceland, then called Gardarsholm, he took on board some crows, *because the mariner's compass was not yet in use.* When he thought he had made a considerable part of his way, he threw up one of his crows, which seeing land astern, flew to it; whence Flock, concluding that he was nearer to Shetland (perhaps rather Faroe,) than any other land, kept on his course for some time, and then sent out another crow, which, seeing no land at all, returned to the vessel. At last having run the greatest part of his way, another crow was sent out by him, which, seeing land ahead, immediately flew for it; and Flock, following his guide, fell in with the east end of the island. Such was the simple mode of steering their course, practised by those bold navigators of the stormy northern ocean. The ancient natives of Taprobané (Ceylon) used the same expedient when skimming along the tranquil surface of the Indian Ocean.—*Plinii Hist. Nat. Lib. vi. c. 22.*

EXTRACT FROM GULLIVER'S TRAVELS.

“In the school of political pro-

jectors I was but ill entertained, the professors appearing in my judgment, wholly out of their senses, which is a scene that never fails to make me melancholy. These unhappy people were proposing schemes for persuading Monarchs to choose favourites on the score of their *wisdom, capacity, and virtue*—of *teaching ministers to consult the public good*—of *rewarding merit, great abilities, and eminent services*—of *instructing Princes to know their true interest* by placing it on the same foundation *as that of their people*—of *choosing for employments people qualified to exercise them*—with many other *wild, impossible chimeras.*”

AN INSTANCE OF VIRTUOUS FEELING,  
ACTIVE EVEN IN THE COMMISSION  
OF CRIME.

About five years since, the county of York was deeply interested in the trial of the father of a large family, who then living in the greatest respectability, was accused of highway robbery. The trial was in York Castle; the prosecutor was a youth of about 20 years of age, the son of a banker, and the prisoner a stout athletic man of 50. The prosecutor had transacted his business as usual at the market town; he had received several sums of money